



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/484,772	01/18/2000	Jeffrey W. Small	30566.86US01	1090
55895 7590 11/29/2012 GATES & COOPER LLP - Autodesk HOWARD HUGHES CENTER 6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050 LOS ANGELES, CA 90045				
EXAMINER LUDWIG, MATTHEW J				
ART UNIT 2178		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 11/29/2012		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

*Ex parte* JEFFREY W. SMALL

---

Appeal 2009-012934  
Application 09/484,772<sup>1</sup>  
Technology Center 2100

---

Before JEAN R. HOMERE, MARC S. HOFF, and  
CARL W. WHITEHEAD, JR., *Administrative Patent Judges*.

HOFF, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellant appeals under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from a final rejection of claims 5, 7-15, 17-25, and 27-34.<sup>2</sup> We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We reverse.

---

<sup>1</sup> The real party in interest is Autodesk, Inc.

<sup>2</sup> Claims 6, 16, and 26 have been cancelled. Claims 1-4 stand withdrawn from consideration based on a restriction requirement. (cite?)

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellant invented a method and apparatus for configuring and associating one or more files in the same application with multiple output devices. A user selects an output device, and configures the output device and page setup options to the user's specifications. Alternatively, the user selects or creates an output device configuration. The selected device(s) and settings are associated with the file, layout, or view by storing some settings with the file, layout, or view and storing other settings with the output device reference (Spec. 8).

Independent claim 5, reproduced below, is representative of the subject matter on appeal.

5. A computer-implemented method for associating multiple output device configurations with information comprising:

selecting information comprising a file generated by a computer application;

selecting one or more output device configurations; and

associating said information with said one or more output device configurations by saving an association between said selected information and said one or more selected output device configurations with said file.

## REFERENCES

Marbry	US 5,692,111	Nov. 25, 1997
Snyders	US 5,982,996	Nov. 9, 1999

## REJECTIONS

Claims 5, 7-10, 12, 14, 15, 17-20, 22, 24, 25, 27-30, 32, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Snyders.

Claims 11, 13, 21, 23, 31, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snyders in view of Marbry.

## ISSUE

Appellant contends, *inter alia*, that neither Snyders nor Marbry teaches or suggests associating an output device configuration with a particular file of information that is generated by a computer application (App. Br. 4). Appellant further argues that neither Snyders nor Marbry teaches or suggests saving an output device configuration with a particular file generated by a computer application (*Id.*).

Appellant's arguments present us with the following issue:

Does Snyders teach selecting information comprising a file generated by a computer application, and associating said information with one or more output device configurations by saving an association between said selected information and said one or more selected output device configurations with said file?

## PRINCIPLES OF LAW

"A rejection for anticipation under section 102 requires that each and every limitation of the claimed invention be disclosed in a single prior art reference." *See In re Buszard*, 504 F.3d 1364, 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (quoting *In re Paulsen*, 30 F.3d 1475, 1478-79 (Fed. Cir. 1994)).

## ANALYSIS

CLAIMS 5, 7-10, 12, 14, 15, 17-20, 22, 24, 25, 27-30, 32, AND 34

Independent claims 5 and 25 recite “selecting information comprising a file generated by a computer application.” Independent claim 15 recites “means, performed by the computer, for creating a file of information.” Claims 5, 15, and 25 each recite “associating said information with said one or more output device configurations by saving an association between said selected information and said one or more selected output device configurations *with said file*” (emphasis added). The Examiner finds that Snyders teaches this limitation, citing column 2, lines 28-49 of Snyders (Ans. 3).

We do not agree with the Examiner that Snyders teaches saving the association with the claimed file (generated by a computer application). Snyders teaches only “saving the printer details of the identified printer driver name in the form of new printer information in a system registry,” “changing the retrieved printer document properties to match new driver settings,” and “saving the new printer document properties in the system registry.” (Fig. 10, s7.27; col. 2, ll. 41-47). Given that the Examiner equates the claimed “file” with “a source job in the form of an intermediate file format comprising an output instruction file” (Snyders col. 2, ll. 12-14), Snyders fails to teach saving an association *with the file*.

We further find that Snyders’ teaching of saving new printer document properties in the *system registry* (col. 2, ll. 41-47) does not equate to “storing an association between said information [comprising a file *generated by a computer application*] ... with said file” as recited in claims 5 and 25, because we find that the system registry is not a file generated by a

computer *application*. We find as well that Snyders' teaching does not equate to storing an association between information (in a file created by the computer) and one or more output device configurations ... with said file" as recited in claim 15, because we find that the system registry is not a file created by the claimed computer.

We further disagree with the Examiner's broad interpretation of the claim. The Examiner's statement that "the only step required to associate said information is to saving the document" would (improperly) read "with said file" out of the claims. (Ans. 6). Accordingly, we find that Snyders does not teach all the limitations of independent claims 5, 15, and 25.

We find that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 5, 7-10, 12, 14, 15, 17-20, 22, 24, 25, 27-30, 32, and 34 as being anticipated by Snyders. We do not sustain the Examiner's § 102 rejection.

#### CLAIMS 11, 13, 21, 23, 31, AND 33

These claims depend from claims 5, 15, or 25, whose rejection we do not sustain. We have reviewed Marbry, and we find that Marbry does not remedy the noted deficiencies of Snyders. We do not sustain the Examiner's § 103 rejection of claims 11, 13, 21, 23, 31, and 33, for the reasons expressed with respect to claims 5, 7-10, 12, 14, 15, 17-20, 22, 24, 25, 27-30, 32, and 34, *supra*.

#### CONCLUSION

Snyders does not teach selecting information comprising a file generated by a computer application, and associating said information with one or more output device configurations by saving an association between

said selected information and said one or more selected output device configurations with said file.

#### DECISION

The Examiner's decision rejecting claims 5, 7-15, 17-25, and 27-34 is reversed.

#### REVERSED

kis